The TV Grilling of Carmichael, P. 2

You Can Always Rely on Henry Cabot Lodge to Miss The Point

"The junta was apparently still not confident enough of its hold on Saigon today to allow a parade of 4,000 troops and armored vehicles to pass through the city's streets. The parade was part of the celebration of Armed Forces Day and the first anniversary of Ky's government. The parade was confined to the heavily guarded Vietnamese General Staff compound near TanSon Nhut airport. The parade was seen only by junta members, about 1,000 guests, including U.S. diplomats and military officers and foreign press representatives. Henry Cabot Lodge, the U.S. Ambassador, called the parade 'a very impressive show.'"

—Neil Sheehan from Saigon in New York Times, *June 20.*

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL XIV, NO. 23 JUNE 27, 1966 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

LBJ Scuttles Another Chance for Peace

The opposition to the war in the country is rising, but the opposition in Congress seems to have been cowed. A year ago when the Gallup poll asked whether the U.S. should continue in Vietnam or pull out, only 20% were for pulling out and 66% were for staying in. When the same question was put this month, the percentage for pulling out had risen to 35% and that for staying in had fallen to 48%. A majority, 54%, believes the war will end in a compromise rather than all-out victory; only 17% think victory likely. But in the three days since the President indicated at an impromptu press conference that he was going to escalate the bombing of the North, only one voice in Congress—that of Senator Gruening of Alaska—has been raised against it. Morse and Gruening remain the only two clearly audible voices of opposition on Capitol Hill.

Air Force Fantasy

There are two main arguments against escalation of the war against the North. The hope that bombing would lead North Vietnam to call off the war has proven sheer fantasy. "Within a few days and with minimum force" as the retiring Commander of the Strategic Air Command, Gen. Thomas S. Power wrote in late 1964, "the conflict in South Vietnam" could be "ended in our favor" simply by bombing selected military depots in the North, after warning civilians away by announcing "the exact time" of our attack. The bombers "would be virtually invulnerable." This is what he wrote in his book, *Design for Survival,* a few months before Johnson took his advice and began the bombing of the North in February 1965. Though the bombing has been far more extensive than anything the SAC commander dared recommend, the result has been a sharply increased flow of men and supplies to the South. The infiltration, according to our own military intelligence, has risen from 800 a month last summer to 4,500 a month this summer, up almost sixfold. American casualties have risen steeply and may reach 50,000 dead and wounded this year. Our bombers, instead of being invulnerable, have taken very heavy losses. As this is written we have just lost our 265th plane over North Vietnam and our 111th in the South (AP from Saigon, *Wash. Eve. Star* June 21). That is a total of 376 planes lost in 15 months of heavy air attack as compared with the 1,041 lost to enemy action in the three years of the Korean War. Clearly Gruening was not exaggerating when he told the Senate last Tuesday that in bombing the North "President Johnson accepted and acted on the same kind of bad advice that led President Kennedy into the Bay of Pigs fiasco." The difference is that Kennedy, unlike Johnson, stopped short of raising the stakes with American lives when that other sure-thing gamble failed.

The Continued Exercise in Self-Delusion

"The progress reported to me by Ambassador Porter is impressive."

—LBJ to a national conference of state legislative leaders at the White House, June 16.

"Q. What about the inflation [in Vietnam]? How is the fight against that going?

"A. Well, that is going pretty well."

—Press conference same day at the State Department with Porter, Deputy Ambassador in Saigon.

"While attention has been riveted on South Vietnam's political crisis, its economic crisis has begun to reach such alarming proportions that American officials here are deeply concerned. They fear that if inflation continues, it could cause even more serious political difficulties. . . . 'The price of rice,' one official said, 'could put a lot bigger mobs in the streets than the monks could muster.' The most common brand of rice in Saigon sold for 800 piastres per 100 kilograms in January. The price now is 1,120 piastres."

—Neil Sheehan from Saigon, N. Y .Times, *June 17.*

"The Minister of Economy and Finance announced a new series of foreign exchange rates. Officially they amounted to a minor devaluation of the piastre. Observers doubted whether they would substantially effect the country's galloping inflation."

—Washington Post *from Saigon June 18.*

The other argument against bombing the North arises from the peculiar timing of the President's announcement. Two envoys, one French, the other Canadian, were on missions to sound out Hanoi on the possibilities for peace when he spoke. Chester Ronning, the Canadian envoy was born in China, speaks Chinese, and was also in Hanoi last March. Canada, Poland and India make up the International Supervisory Commission set up by the Geneva conference of 1954. The other envoy, Jean Saintény, was in Peking on his way to Hanoi. It was M. Saintény who in 1945-46, successfully

(*Continued on Page Four*)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Since When Has Gandhi-ism Been Our National Creed?

We found the questioning of Stokely Carmichael on *Face The Nation* and of James Meredith on *Meet the Press* last Sunday overbearing and humorless. Though the reporters were all decent and liberal, they sounded just a little like cops in a back room putting a Negro suspect through the wringer. There was only one Negro on the panels, and he was pasteurized enough to be on *Time* Magazine. His position was like that of a Negro trusty assigned to stand by while the Sheriff has a heart-to-heart talk with the prisoner. Mr. Carmichael's crime was to have abandoned the philosophy of non-violence, and Mr. Meredith, too, was suspected of slight leanings that way. Stern white faces admonished the suspects to come clean. Nobody seemed to remember that McNamara is no Mahatma in a loin-cloth; that the 50-billion a year we give the Pentagon is not for basic training in turning the other cheek; that we are not engaged in dropping Bibles on North Vietnam; and that we so take violence against Negroes and their white sympathizers in the South for granted that it is easier to get away with their murder than to park beside a fireplug. Yet almost incredulously Mr. Carmichael was asked "You don't reject violence?" and back came that sassy answer, "No, I have never rejected violence." We never heard such talk on the old plantation as long as grandpappy was alive. It was comforting, however, that Mr. Meredith, citing the benefits of nine years in the Air Force, was able to assure TV listeners that he thought non-violence was fine. We hope General Le May was listening.

Political Heat Rash

The Senate Internal Security Committee must be suffering from political heat rash. Its report on the Communist Youth program, the du Bois Clubs and the campus peace movement is the most turgid bit of tripe this committee, a doddering relic of the witch hunt, has yet to turn in. One of the woozziest aspects was the adoption of a new technique. Instead of subpoening witnesses who had been "named", as McCarthy used to say, the staff sent them a letter saying, in one typical case, "On May 18, 1965, testimony was adduced whereby the subcommittee was informed in substance that while an employee of the U.S. Geodetic Survey, Menlo Park, you participated in picketing a Government agency in 1960, the House Committee on Un-American Activities," and asking whether he had anything to say for himself. The exhibits in the back of the report show that the accused thereupon consulted a lawyer, and the lawyer (in this case Lawrence Speiser of the American Civil Liberties Union's Washington office) replied, "In order for us to make an intelligent decision as to whether the testimony was adverse and whether he should accept your offer to appear, we would like to request a copy of the transcript . . ." and "of the rules of procedure." The typical reply was (we quote that to Mr. Speiser), "The subcommittee declines to be drawn into a controvery because of the extension of a courtesy." That ended it, but in the report itself these requests to see the transcript are adduced as evidence of a "subtle" Communist plot!

McGeorge Bundy's testimony calling on the Germans to accept the Oder-Neisse line and to give up nuclear ambitions was no surprise to those who knew his efforts during the Kennedy Administration to unfreeze German policy. The Bundy testimony must be read, however, in the light of de Gaulle's visit to Moscow, which has started a race both in Washington and Bonn to deal with the Russians on Germany directly before de Gaulle can make a deal over their heads. The essential point about the de Gaulle visit, however, is that both Moscow and Washington are against the policy of power blocs only on the other side of the fence. Each would like to dissolve the other's bloc but each hates to see independence in its own. Each has been talking freely about German unity, as long as there was no danger of its achievement. But the time is coming in which both will have second thoughts. For if Germany is unified, Europe will be unified and if Europe is unified both the Russian and American-led blocs will dissolve. This is what neither Big Power capital really desires.

Minor Non-Lamentable Disasters Dept.

"John Roche, professor at Brandeis, former president of ADA and speech-writer during the 1964 campaign for Vice President Humphrey, was a leading contender to succeed Walt Rostow as chairman of the State Department's Policy Planning Staff. The job, however, went to Henry Owen, Rostow's deputy. Insiders say Roche's past ADA connection hurt him with conservatives and his present pro-Administration stand on Vietnam turned his former ADA colleagues against him."

—*Postscripts in* Washington Post, *June 20.*

Samples of the Queries Some Senator Ought to Be Able to Put to The CIA

When and if that long postponed battle over the CIA bursts out on the Senate floor, here are three items which indicate the need for more stringent control:

(1) The recent massacre of Communists, real and suspected, in Indonesia, was one of the worst blood-baths even of our sanguinary times. Estimates of the number killed range from 300,000 to 1,000,000. Did the CIA have a hand? "There was a great deal more contact between the anti-Communist forces in that country and at least one very high official in Washington," James Reston wrote in the New York Times June 19, "than is generally realized."

(2) The Times of London reported June 18 from Washington that the U.S. has reports that nationals of a friendly country have been financing the Buddhist opposition in Vietnam, that millions of piastres have been in Hue and Danang and that "one man, said to be a professor, has been identified." This originated in a briefing given West European correspondents by LBJ. The country accused is France. The French are furious over this typical Vietnamese canard, which recalls similar tall tales about French funds in General Khanh's earlier coup against "Big" Minh. How come such unverified drivel can reach the President as hard intelligence?

(3) Robert McCloskey, State Department spokesman, told the press last week Castro hadn't been seen in Cuba since May 1. Le Monde reports from Havana (June 18) that this has evoked surprise in Cuba where Castro was at a televised public meeting June 4 and received the Secretary General of UNESCO June 13. What's wrong with CIA's network in Cuba that we can be so misinformed?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Do You Have to Be An Informer to Qualify As A Good American?

A Washington dispatch in the *New York Times* June 17 said the Board of Immigration Appeals had ruled that a former Communist need not become an informer to avoid deportation. We are sorry to report that this is not correct. The decision to which that story referred was handed down in the Williams case. This stirred so much indignation in England at one time that it was the subject of a debate in the House of Commons and of a plea from the British government to the State Department against his deportation to that country.

Wife and Child Native Born

Frederick J. Williams was born in Wales. He came to this country at the age of one. His wife, child and siblings are native born; one brother was killed fighting for the United States. He was nevertheless ordered deported 12 years ago (1954) on the ground that he had been a Communist from 1931 to 1947. One of the grounds for deportation was that the sincerity of his defection was put in doubt by his refusal to inform on his ex-comrades for the Immigration Service.

It would have been a pleasure to report that the Board of Immigration Appeals had handed down a decision declaring that an alien does not have to be an informer to prove that he is qualified to stay in this country. His credentials were good. His union, the Auto Workers, assigned its counsel, Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., to defend him. The Michigan AFL-CIO and the Greater Detroit Industrial Union Council have been battling his deportation. The President of the Detroit City Council signed an affidavit in his favor. The county auditor of Wayne County, Michigan, who describes himself as "a commie fighter from a way back", testified that he knew Williams when the latter was "a commie" and is satisfied that he is so no longer. His pastor swore that Williams is leading a Christian life and attends church regularly. A neighbor told investigators "she believed he had an American attitude."

This was not enough for the Board. It also inferred opposition to Communism from the fact that in 1961, six years after the deportation order, he finally gave in and told the FBI who was active with him in the party and offered to testify against them. The Board also inferred rectitude from the fact that on two occasions he offered to testify before the Un-American Activities Committee. While Williams then declined to name names, the Board is impressed that "he now states that if he had been called and had been pressed to give names, he would have done so."

In other words, poor Williams has proven himself a man of character by abandoning his principles under the terrible fear of being deported. He has proven himself a good American, by finally agreeing to be a political stoolpigeon; this is also the ultimate test of loyalty applied to suspected heretics in the Communist bloc. It is not enough to be a Christian. One must also be a Judas. These are the principles of Americanism to be inferred from this decision.

End of Another McCarthy Era Relic

Free trade unions, as Meany and Lovestone often observe, are unions free from government control. The Mine, Mill case, as they never seemed to notice, was a test of this in our own society. The Communist Control Act of 1954 provided that any union found to be "Communist infiltrated" by the Subversive Activities Control Board would be barred from NLRB elections. It would thus have prevented workers from voting for a union the government had blacklisted. The first and only attempt to enforce these constitutionally dubious provisions has now been dropped by the Justice Department after 11 years of litigation. Four years ago the Court of Appeals threw out an earlier SACB order against the Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers Union on the ground that the evidence was "stale". It was not so much stale as rancid, since it was based on the gamey testimony of dubious informers. This marks the end, we hope, of any attempt to enforce this relic of the McCarthy era. We only pause to note that we owe the original act (as the Weekly protested at the time) to the effort of the Senate's liberals under Humphrey and Morse to prove themselves more anti-Communist than McCarthy!

P.S. The Supreme Court's new decision ordering a new (third) trial for six officers of Mine, Mill for criminal conspiracy to evade the non-Communist affidavit provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act will probably end in acquittal, if the case is not dropped by Justice. The Court gave them access to grand jury minutes to show discrepancies in the informer testimony against them. If this adds to the discrepancies already evident between their trial testimony and their testimony before SACB and HUAC, conviction is most unlikely.

Black Again Swings The Supreme Court Against The Civil Rights Movement

The 5-to-4 decision by the Supreme Court in the Rachel and Peacock cases last Monday were bad news for the civil rights movement. The majority, through Mr. Justice Stewart, interpreted very narrowly a century-old Reconstruction statute providing for the removal of civil rights cases to the Federal courts. The Court allowed removal for 20 persons arrested for criminal trespass when they tried to integrate an Atlanta, Georgia, restaurant. Here the Court held that what was trespass under Georgia law was a civil right under the public accommodations section of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. State prosecution was therefore barred.

But the same majority declined to allow removal in the cases of 29 persons arrested on various charges, such as obstructing traffic, during a Negro voter registration drive in Leflore country, Mississippi. The Court held there was no Federal law conferring an absolute right "to obstruct a public street" nor conferring "immunity from state prosecution on such charges." The State police thus have a wide range of subterfuges on which to arrest civil rights workers without risking removal to a Federal court.

Douglas, Warren, Brennan and Fortas dissented. Had Black joined them the Mississippi cases would have gone the other way but he is generally unfriendly to sit-in and other direct action techniques. The practical difference is enormous. The Court's ruling will force arrested civil rights workers to go through prolonged litigation in the hostile State courts before they can appeal to the Federal.

The Justice Department filed a brief amicus, asking the Court to interpret the removal privilege liberally. Now the Administration should be pressed to support either the Javits-Kennedy removal amendment to the pending Civil Rights bill or the removal provisions in the Douglas-Case bill, which would give Negroes access to the Federal courts wherever the "climate of racial justice" prevents fair trial.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Why U Thant Spoke So Bitterly of Our "Barbarous War"

(*Continued from Page One*)

negotiated with Ho Chi Minh an agreement whereby the Viet Minh were to stay in the French Union in return for self-government. The breakdown of that agreement under rightist French military pressure led to the long war which ended at Dien Bien Phu. M. Saintény has told the story with impressive magnanimity in his *Histoire d'Une Paix Manquée* (Paris, 1953). He will be received by Ho as an old and trusted friend, the fellow survivor of an historic lost opportunity for a peaceful and honorable settlement.

A Moment of Fragile Hope

Three days before the President's press conference, *Le Monde* (June 15) carried an *Agence France Presse* dispatch from Hanoi saying that diplomatic circles in the North Vietnamese capital had begun to feel a little optimistic about the possibility of negotiations. A "still fragile" hope was based, according to *AFP*, on three factors (1) all North Vietnam's allies except Peking ardently desire a swift end of the war, (2) While Peking 18 months ago violently attacked Moscow for trying to help the Americans make a face-saving withdrawal from Vietnam, Hanoi was now ready to do just that, (3) North Vietnam felt strong enough to make peace without loss of face itself, since it feels able to weather American bombing "however severe." *AFP* also reported that Premier Pham Van Dong, in the presence of a Soviet bloc diplomat, is said to have declared that Vietnam "like France, was an advocate of neutralization."

This moment of reviving hope for peace was a strange time for the President to announce, as he did June 18, that "We must continue to raise the cost of aggression at its source" i.e. to step up the bombing of North Vietnam. This was a good way to nip in the bud any possibility of success for the Canadian and French peace probes before they had a chance. Mr. Johnson's swift action to discourage peace negotiations recalls that his bombing of the North began in February, 1965, the day after the Soviet Premier, Kosygin, reached Hanoi on an earlier peace mission. A working group of scholars at Berkeley and at Washington University in St. Louis were about to release a 100-page "Citizens' White Paper" on "The Politics of Escalation" this week-end in which they demonstrate that Mr. Johnson has escalated the war whenever pressure rose for peace at home or the possibilities of negotiation improved abroad.

Perhaps this is why, two days after the President's press conference, Secretary General U Thant of the United Nations spoke so bitterly of this "barbarous war" and again suggested that peace could be achieved only by de-escalation, by an end to the bombing of the North, and by a readiness to enter into discussions with those who are "actually fighting", i.e. the NLF. LBJ has set his face against each of these measures. The Citizens' White Paper shows that on several occasions U Thant's own initiatives for peace have been squelched by Johnsonian escalations. The only logical conclusion is that Johnson does not want negotiations which will entail withdrawal from South Vietnam. He wants to crush the rebellion and reestablish a South Vietnam securely within the U.S. orbit, even if that means burning up much of the country North and South in the process. *June 21*

A Peculiar Way to Pacify

"The President received an encouraging report from Wm. Porter, Deputy Ambassador to Saigon, on progress of the rural pacification program in Vietnam."
—New York Times, *June 17.*

"President Johnson complains that newsmen have ignored the civil pacification program in Vietnam. He'd understand why if he was a reporter trying to get some straight facts about it. At a White House briefing this week, Ambassador Porter and Presidential Assistant Robert Komer told newsmen the program has been so successful that large numbers of South Vietnamese are leaving Viet Cong areas. How many? Komer said the monthly rate is now 20,000. Asked how this compared with last year, he referred reporters to the State Department. It confirmed the 20,000 a month rate, but said it was 50,000 a year ago and added that refugee flow had nothing to do with pacification."
—Washington Daily News, *June 18.*

To speak plainly—it's our heavy bombing that forces people to flee from Viet Cong areas not "pacification".

Notices: Next Weekly (summer schedule) July 11. We gratefully acknowledge the services of Peter Osnos during the past year as editorial assistant.

I. F. Stone's Weekly 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington, D. C. 20015

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

6/27/30

For the enclosed $5 send a gift sub to:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

For $5.35 extra send I. F. Stone's *The Haunted Fifties*

Indicate if announcement wished ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except in August, the last week in December and the first week in January and Bi-Weekly during July at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N.W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED